

## MINUTES OF TTF CG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on March 13, 2002. The following people were in attendance:

### MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724

Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595

Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609

Eric Carzon OMB (240) 777-2763

Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252

Willem Van Aller DIST (240) 777-2994

Rey Junquera DPWT (240) 777-6086

### STAFF

Amy Rowan OCA (240) 777-3684

Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762

Kip Thomas OCA

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700

Kamal Johari CTC (410) 964-5700

### OTHER ATTENDEES

Sean Hughes Nextel

Bill O'Brien VoiceStream (443) 570-1032

Steve Weber VoiceStream (571) 277-0235

Carolyn Mitchell Cingular

Maureen Kane-Smith VoiceStream

Jim Michal for Sprint PCS

Janet Brown for Sprint PCS

Bo Duncan Atlantic Western Cons.

Jill Rapczynski Atlantic Western Cons.

Michael Steele CMS/BA Consulting

M.G. Diamond for Verizon Wireless

John Steele Verizon Wireless

Robin Bryan Darnestown Civic Assoc.

Tim Wilson Darnestown Civic Assoc.

Action Item: Approval of January 17, 2002 minutes: Bob Hunnicutt reminded the group that they had already approved the minutes from the January meeting via proxy e-mail. There were no changes to the minutes and they were unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Internet Access to Latitude/Longitude Coordinates: Jane Lawton announced that she had received a request to remove the latitude and longitude coordinates for water tanks listed on the database available over the Internet at the County's Website. She added that, for security reasons, she wished to remove all latitude and longitude coordinates from the database on the Website. She asked the industry representatives if this would pose any problems for them in accessing information for co-location purposes.

Willem Van Aller noted that the coordinates in the database provide more accurate information to the carriers than just the address because it gives the exact location of the facility on the site. He added that tower coordinates are also available from the FCC. Lee Afflerbach stated it was possible to limit access to information via the Internet by using passwords.

Ms. Lawton replied that the information is much more readily available from the County's Website than from the FCC's database which contains a database of towers from across the country. She also made it clear that this was not an effort to remove coordinates from the database maintained by the Tower Coordinator for sharing with the carriers, but they were just removing the database available by Internet access.

Maureen Kane-Smith added that the carriers can always pick up a copy of the database at each TTFCG meeting.

Amy Rowan noted that the Tower Coordinator could directly provide the complete database to those carriers that needed it. Sean Hughes stated that Nextel does use that information, but they could get it directly from the Tower Coordinator.

Jim Michal commented that the carriers do not need that information since they have their own site acquisition staff who can identify locations by latitude and longitude on their own. He stated he would rather see the County err on the side of homeland security than make this information available via the Internet.

Robin Bryan, of Darnestown Civic Association, asked how citizens could get that information if they needed it for engineering purposes. Ms. Lawton replied that they, too, could obtain it from the Tower Coordinator upon request.

Ms. Lawton stated that since she did not hear any major objection to removing the location coordinates from the database available by Internet, she would continue with that policy.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 87' level of an existing 120' monopole located at the Baptist Home for Children property at 6301 Greentree Road in Bethesda (Application #200201-02).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that this was a by-right attachment to the Baptist Home tree monopole in Bethesda. He added that the Tower Coordinator's recommendation was conditioned on a modification to the Special Exception, if needed, to permit use of a larger ground space for equipment shelters than permitted by the Special Exception.

Pat Hanehan complimented the Park and Planning Commission and Michael Ma in helping to resolve issues related to this attachment. He noted that this attachment is in lieu of a proposed light pole replacement at North Bethesda Middle School, a siting which neighbors had expressed concern. He said that with the help of the Park and Planning Commission, the carrier was able to successfully negotiate an agreement with the property owner for use of this site.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Proposed Legislative Changes to the TTFCG Application: Mr. Van Aller commented that he believed the request for latitude and longitude should specify that the desired format is minutes, degrees, seconds.

Michael Ma commented that with regard to requiring balloon tests for new structures, in some cases, carriers have performed balloon tests but residents later complain that the balloon test photographs are biased and do not accurately depict the impact of the structure on their neighborhood. Consequently, the carrier then needs to conduct an additional set of balloon tests. Bob Hunnicutt explained that balloon tests are often performed prior to the submission of the application to the TTFCG and, in some cases, the photographs are already provided with the application. He stated that he believed the intent of this proposed change was to give a better sense of what the impact of the facility may be, noting that there may be disagreement on this impact. He said that the photographs of the balloon only indicate the top of the antenna at the proposed site and it is not quite as good as some of the photo simulations he has seen of towers at a site.

Jim Michal said that he believes this requirement is beyond the jurisdiction of the TTFCG and he objects to requiring carriers to perform balloon tests in advance of it being needed, especially when there may be no objection to the facility. He said it could be an unnecessary expense for the carriers. He added that he also did not believe it was appropriate to have balloon tests for simple attachments to existing structures or rooftops. He commented that the language requiring photo simulations and balloon tests should be made clear

that it is a requirement for new towers or monopoles only, and suggested that the use of the word "structure" in this section was not clear enough.

Mr. Van Aller suggested alternative language to add "or any other demonstration indicating what the appearance of the tower or monopole at the proposed location may look like". Pat Hanehan agreed that a balloon test may not be required, but that more generic language such as Mr. Van Aller had suggested, may be more appropriate. Lee Afflerbach noted that for some applications it is very important to clearly understand the impact of the facility, especially for taller towers like AM broadcast antennas/towers.

Robin Bryan said he believed it was very important for the citizens to have balloon test information, and he noted that in the requirements for the TTF CG it was incumbent upon them to consider the impact on the community.

Sean Hughes commented that it was difficult to show other telecommunications facilities within 1,500 feet because of the scale of the site plan. Michael Ma suggested that it could be indicated on the vicinity plan which is also submitted with the application.

Mr. Van Aller asked what "NEPA" meant. Bob Hunnicutt explained that it was the National Environmental Protection Agency. Eric Carzon suggested that all acronyms be spelled out on the form. Jim Michal stated he believed this requirement was also only necessary for new structures.

Sean Hughes commented that the requirement for submitting a copy of the approved FAA certificate with the TTF CG application could delay the application process considerably, since it is often months before the FAA issues its reply to tower applications. Jim Michal added that the FAA does not always issue a report and that all applications do not require FAA review. Jane Lawton noted that the proposed language requires attaching a copy of the FAA report only if FAA review is required. Maureen Kane-Smith stated that if an FAA review is needed, she already submits a copy with the TTF CG application, but she agreed that to hold up an application for the FAA response would make the process much longer.

Lee Afflerbach stated that there could be only three replies related to the FAA review: 1) if a certificate was needed; 2) if so, has an application been submitted and is still pending; or 3) the carrier has a certificate in hand. Bob Hunnicutt suggested that he revise this requirement to add the three points mentioned by Mr. Afflerbach in question format to address the carriers' concerns. Ms. Lawton agreed and asked that the application be amended to that effect.

Jim Michal commented regarding the requirement to state measures taken to prevent aggregate RF on rooftops. If a carrier is the first one on the roof, he believes there is no need to address aggregate RF. Bob Hunnicutt noted that the language was not a change to the application and has been a requirement all along. He noted that the intent in asking that question is to know what steps the carrier has taken to give notice to people accessing a rooftop of any potential hazards located there.

Robin Bryan asked why the application is being changed to show residences only within 300 feet. He stated he would like to see residences identified at perhaps two-to-three times that distance. Ms. Lawton stated that the application was being revised to reflect suggestions made by Council staff and to incorporate that language from the proposed text amendment. She added that the TTF CG review is more of a technical review and the distance from surrounding homes is more of a zoning issue. She added that Mr. Bryan's comments on this matter are germane, however, and should be submitted as part of his testimony at the public hearing on the legislation. She stated that for purposes of looking at co-location and zoning issues, this distance would probably suffice.

Bob Hunnicutt said that these are only proposed changes and he did not envision revising the application until all of these issues were resolved and the final legislation package was adopted. Jane Lawton concurred, but asked Mr. Hunnicutt to draft the changes discussed at today's meeting for the group to review prior to adoption of the legislation. Ms. Lawton said she would take meeting comments under advisement in preparing the group's comments to the Council on this legislation.

Discussion Item - Zoning Text Amendment 02-02, Telecommunications Facilities: Jane Lawton summarized the changes in the order in which they appear in the draft document. She noted that many of the changes were not new but were to clarify language that was already contained in the zoning text. Ms. Lawton stated

that she had attended several meetings with Ms. Praisner, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Royalty, and Mr. Cogan to discuss these proposed changes. She noted that most of the language contained in the legislation comes from Ms. Praisner, who introduced the legislation.

The following comments were made regarding the proposed changes:

" Circle 3, line 20: Dave Niblock commented that it appeared this meant only attachment to accessory structures in these residential zones would not be permitted by-right. He also noted that this did not address agricultural or rural zones. M.G. Diamond asked if this was referring to something like a windmill. Eric Carzon said he thought it meant a garage or shed at a single-family residence. Ms. Lawton commented that she thought this was a worthwhile improvement in the zoning text, but along with Mr. Niblock, wondered how it would work in agricultural zones. Lee Afflerbach and Willem Van Aller noted that there were other antennas besides cellular antennas, such as HAM radio and citizen band antennas, which would be appropriate for attachment to garages on residential properties. They suggested that there should be a distinction between those antennas and commercial cellular type antennas.

" Circle 5, line 23: Dave Niblock wondered what the words "unless a closer proximity is required for service" meant. Lee Afflerbach explained that there are certain tower/antenna structures such as AM radio towers, which must be within a certain distance from each other in order to properly function. Bob Hunnicutt added that he believed this text was added to preclude the possibility of "antenna farms". Eric Carzon thought this could be problematic in cases when a monopole is full and placement of a second structure next to the existing monopole would be more acceptable than selecting a new, perhaps more obtrusive, location for a second structure. M.G. Diamond agreed that for certain secluded locations, placing a second structure at the same location as an existing structure might be preferable. Maureen Kane-Smith added that this language would preclude a second attachment to an existing stadium light pole. Lee Afflerbach noted that in Howard County, he had seen cases where a second pole was constructed because there was a height limitation on the existing structure. He suggested that a revision to the text allowing for a special showing for a second structure would be appropriate, and noted that this is how the FCC handles situations like this when there may be an acceptable reason for an exception to the rules. Jim Michal commented that it appeared this would mean a second facility on a rooftop would not be permitted. He suggested that adding the words "new freestanding" support structure to the text would make this language more clear. Eric Carzon agreed that some additional language should be a part of this change to permit discretion for a second facility when it was appropriate.

" Circle 6, line 10: M.G. Diamond asked why this requirement was being deleted. Rey Junquera commented that this was probably related to determining setback from an individual parcel versus setback from a property line perimeter of a number of parcels under single ownership.

" Circle 6, line 15: Dave Niblock wondered if this was referring to a main building or to an accessory building.

" Circle 6, line 18: Jim Michal suggested this be changed to say "less visually obtrusive" location.

" Circle 6, line 21: Jim Michal suggested the language be changed to reflect that it is referring to setback from an off-site residential building. For example, he noted that if a farm property owner wanted a monopole closer to their home, it should be their right to make that determination. He also noted that on some farms, barns or silos can add screening to the tower from surrounding areas. Eric Carzon and Jane Lawton agreed with those comments.

" Circle 7, line 1: Jim Michal asked about the origin of the 155-foot height limit. Michal Ma suggested it may have come from a past Park and Planning Commission meeting with industry representatives at which time the commissioners asked the industry representatives if there were any objections to a height limit of 155 feet and there were no objections. Eric Carzon commented that for this change, the language needed an exception for cases when it was appropriate to be higher for some pertinent reason. Lee Afflerbach noted that height limitations may be appropriate for cellular towers but there are other taller towers, such as the case with the MPT broadcast tower and a proposed set of AM broadcast towers which he has already preliminarily reviewed with a station owner, who expects to file an application in the near future. Mr. Afflerbach said those types of services require taller towers to function properly.

" Jim Michal commented that if a tower can be extended to accommodate co-location, the second carrier has

an advantage in getting a structure approved at a taller height.

" Circle 7, line 4: Jim Michal suggested the language be changed to say, "the antenna and support structure should be sited to minimize the visual impact on the community. The carrier should be encouraged to design the antenna and support structure to blend into the surrounding environment..." Eric Carzon added that sometimes the camouflage is more objectionable than the antenna itself and there should be a way to encourage stealth design or screening with discretion.

" Circle 7, line 11: M.G. Diamond asked why this change was being made in this instance when it was not true for any other County Special Exception.

" Circle 7, line 12: Eric Carzon commented that the word "freestanding" had been deleted and asked if this only applied to rooftop antennas. Mr. Van Aller also commented that there were also guyed structures that this change would impact.

" Circle 7, line 23: Dave Niblock asked why this requirement was only for freestanding structures and was not applicable to every TTFCG site.

" Circle 8, line 1: Willem Van Aller commented that there was also a need to require the antenna structure registration number on the signage.

" Circle 8, line 4: There were questions regarding the definition of "equipment or other items".

" Circle 8, line 7: M.G. Diamond stated that originally, carriers were told that they would be able to apply for Special Exceptions and the TTFCG review concurrently, which this language would negate. He agreed it was perhaps appropriate to require the TTFCG's Record of Action at the time of a Special Exception hearing, but did not believe it was necessary to have it simply to file for Special Exception.

M.G. Diamond said that since there were changes being made to the zoning text, this would be an appropriate time to address the issue of the height of antennas above building rooftops. Michael Ma commented that current pending legislation already corrects problems regarding that issue.

Discussion Item - Bill 6-02, Telecommunications Facility Coordination - Fees: Dave Niblock commented that the only other instance a fee as great as \$10,000 was required is for adult entertainment facilities. Many meeting attendees asked what was the basis of the \$10,000 fee. Jane Lawton attributed the amount to Michael Cogan. She said she had provided Mr. Cogan with the average costs the County spent for the Tower Coordinator's review. Eric Carzon asked if he could be provided with those latest cost figures. Bob Hunnicutt agreed to provide that information to Mr. Carzon. Sean Hughes asked if that cost information could also be given to the Council members. Jane Lawton replied that had already been done. She noted that according to Mr. Cogan, during the legislation review the amount could always be reduced, but once introduced the amount could not be increased. Jim Michal commented that he believed \$10,000 was inappropriate for a simple by-right attachment to an existing structure. He added that he does not know why there is a requirement for a TTFCG application on a by-right attachment to an existing structure since the carriers are doing exactly what the County wants them to do - co-locate on existing structures. He added that he agreed there may be a need for notice of antenna placement to update the County's database, but he did not believe those types of attachments even needed to go through the full review process. Jane Lawton commented that she believed it was appropriate to have all antenna placements go through the review process. Mr. Van Aller said he agreed with Mr. Michal and stated he had questioned that requirement in the past as well.

Discussion Item - PEPCO Coordination Office: Bob Hunnicutt commented that PEPCO had created a new office to coordinate joint use of PEPCO facilities. He stated that William Lopez was in charge of that office and provided Mr. Lopez's contact information to the carriers.

Discussion Item - Recent Publications: Jane Lawton distributed an article on tower issues from Telecommunications Reports. Bob Hunnicutt distributed copies of a recent Gazette article regarding tower issues in Montgomery County.

Discussion Item - January 29, 2002 letter from Chairman Holmes: Jane Lawton distributed copies of a letter from Chairman Holmes of the Park and Planning Commission. She stated that she just wanted to make the

group aware that proposals in the letter had been made. Michael Ma added that this was a clarification of an earlier Park and Planning Commission's position on this matter.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, April 10, 2002 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room #225 of the COB.

\\Ctcserver\clients\Mc-Tower\Documents\Mtg Minutes\2002 Minutes\02Mar13.min.doc